

National Archives Assembly Legacy Project  
Interview Interview with Robert Kvasnicka

October 23, 2007

Interviewer: We'll start off talking about your personal history, then your career at the National Archives, and finally of institutional history. So first, where did you grow up?

Kvasnicka: Minnesota. We lived in Minneapolis for the most part, but I spent a lot of time on my grandparents farm however in the summers.

Interviewer: Really? Whereabouts?

Kvasnicka: In southern Minnesota, just outside a little town called Elysian, which is not too far from Mankato.

Interviewer: Did you go to school in Minnesota?

Kvasnicka: Yeah, University of Minnesota.

Interviewer: How did you end up in Washington?

Kvasnicka: I took the Civil Service Exam. (Laughs) Looking for something to do before I got drafted and I was offered the job here. I had no idea what an archivist was at the time, but the job made use of my history degree.

Interviewer: Was it in U.S. history?

Kvasnicka: Yes. I wasn't particularly keen on teaching but that was probably what I would have gone into. This was a stop gap job. I came to DC in October of '57 and then was drafted in April of '58. I left during a horrible snow storm on a bus that was probably the last one to get through the Pennsylvania turnpike before they shut it down. The snow was just terrible. I don't know if you were here at the time but we had a few years there in the late 50's and early 60's that we really had bad weather and that was one of them. We had had several big snow falls that winter while I was here.

Interviewer: Where were you headed on the bus?

Kvasnicka: Back to Minneapolis were I was inducted into the army. I was in the army for two years, and I was discharged in '61. Since I had an easy assignment I extended for a third

year to get rid of the active reserve obligation. Then I came back here in '61.

Interviewer: And what was the first thing you did when you got here? Or, I didn't ask you what they had you doing before you got in the Army.

Kyasnicka: When I came to the National Archives in '57 I was assigned to the natural resources branch. The branch chief was Jane Smith. My first job was supervising the boxing of records from the Bureau of Mines, making box lists, and things like that. Evidently I made enough of an impression that they did want me to return after I got out of the army. Of course they were obligated to take me back but Richard Maxwell, the assistant branch chief, let me know they really wanted me back. I might have stayed in Minneapolis if I had found a job there, but since I had a pretty good job waiting for me in DC I decided to return even though the salary wasn't much. It was under \$4000 a year at that time.

Interviewer: And that what grade was that?

Kyasnicka: I came in as an entry level archivist, either grade three or four, I can't remember which. I do remember that getting grade 5 a big deal and I had to do a draft inventory of the Bureau of Mines records to qualify for it. I think grade 7 was the journeyman grade and if you got a nine you pretty much had it made. Later there was a major shift in the grade levels and eleven became the journeyman grade.

Interviewer: I wondered about that. So when you came back up you went back to the same unit?

Kyasnicka: Yes. Until I went to the editorial office on a temporary detail in late 1987 or early 1988 (I can't remember exactly when), I had worked with the same group of records, doing reference and project work with the Interior Department and New Deal records.

Interviewer: What were your initial impressions of the archives were when you first got here?

Kyasnicka: They were fine.

Interviewer: I was going to say to you, I was looking at your Trans-Mississippi West Guide and that is just amazing to me. You've compiled volumes describing records of the Interior, Agriculture, State and Justice departments. How long did it take you to do that?

Kyasnicka: I started the guide in 1989. My original detail to the editorial office was to coordinate work on the guides to the records of the Senate and House of Representatives that Congress had asked the Archives to compile for publication as part of its bicentennial celebration in 1989. Work on the Senate volume was going along fine, but the format of the House volume was more complicated. To simplify the committee chapters Ed Schamel, the primary compiler of the guide, had developed time lines showing the longevity of each committee and charts showing the types of records available, but work on descriptions of the records themselves was lagging behind. Trudy Peterson, who was the Division head at the time, asked me to take the detail. She was familiar with my work because I had been her assistant when she was head of the natural resources branch. Since I had pretty much had my fill of the reference and project work I had been doing for such a long time, I was glad of the opportunity to do something a little different. While I was on the detail I also worked on the guide to records of the Still Pictures Branch with Mary Jane Dowd's preliminary inventory of Record Group 42, which, by the way, contains what must be one of the longest footnotes in any NARA publication. If I had been a little more savvy at the time it would have been an appendix. In any event, while I was working on the legislative guides the questions of how to handle the continuation of the Territorial Papers was raised by the Western History Association and some other history societies.

At the time, the National Archives was under a mandate to publish records relating to the U.S. Territories. The project stalled after publication of the hard bound volumes and some 20 microfilm rolls of documents for Wisconsin and microfilm publications of records for Iowa, Minnesota, and Oregon. The sheer volume of material relating to the territorial periods for States entering the Union after Wisconsin was so great the continuation of the project was too time consuming and expensive to be feasible. As an alternative, the Archives and the historical societies agreed on the publication of a guide to territorial records. The archivist who was asked to do the guide declined, saying it wasn't feasible, and he was right. But the idea of the guide appealed to me and I submitted a plan to Trudy who approved it. I got the job and my detail to the editorial office became a permanent assignment. I don't think that Trudy expected the scope of the guides to be what it became, however. So far as I'm concerned the guide is still unfinished, but so far as the Archives concerned it's done.

Under my plan the scope of the guide was expanded to cover records for all of the contiguous states west of the Mississippi River for the territorial period, 1804-1912. This allowed me to include materials for California and Texas which didn't follow the usual territorial pattern. I went through the National Archives guide and determined that about 100 records groups contained relevant records. Because of the large number of record groups involved I immediately dismissed the idea of a subject arrangement and decided instead to go with record group chapters. In compiling these chapters I reviewed all the published and unpublished finding aids, box and file lists, and microfilm pamphlets available for each record group. I accepted the published materials at face value unless I had questions about entries

and then I actually examined the records. Most of my descriptions are similar to preliminary inventory entries although the arrangement and content information is often more detailed. I also incorporated file lists and item descriptions when warranted. Most of the chapters involved relatively little original descriptive work on my part so the work progressed rather quickly. Exceptions to that were the records of the Weather Bureau so I figured that would be an easy chapter, but it turned out they had been published before many accessions had been received. So I ended up describing a lot of material from scratch. The records of the Bureau of Land Management (General Land Office) posed another problem which I'll discuss a bit.

To begin with I compiled the chapters at random, working on the smaller record groups first. As the chapters began to accumulate the question of a publication format arose. It was obvious that a single volume guide was going to be impractical so Sharon Thibodeau, then head of the editorial office, and I decided to follow the "cluster approach" adopted by the NA staff preparing records for the move to College Park. Since I already compiled the chapters for the agencies under the State Department that volume was the first to be published. The guide originally was titled "A Guide to Federal Records for the Territorial Period, 1804-1912," but the marketing office objected so the main title became "The Trans-Mississippi West, 1904-1912," with the word "guide" in each subtitle. As a result the volumes are catalogued in the NA library as western history rather than guides and filed apart from the other NA guides.

Five volumes had been published by early 1997 when I began work on the General Land Office records. It was to be the third and final volume of guides to the records of the Interior Department. I was already eligible for retirement when I started it but nothing approaching a comprehensive finding aid was available for this important and heavily researched record group so I really wanted to do it. If I had known that it would take nearly 10 years to complete I might have thought differently. During that 10 year period I also worked on revisions of the guide to genealogical records and the catalogue of Indian-related microfilm publications but most of my time was devoted to work on the GLO records. A draft inventory was available as well as a published inventory for the land entry papers and a few other select series so I figured compilation of the guide would probably take 3 to 4 years to complete. I soon discovered that there was a reason why the draft inventory had never been published. Most of it was really bad, so bad in fact that I was authorized to dispose of it.

Interviewer: Do you know how the draft inventory was compiled?

Kyasnicka: Actually, I do. Just recently I came across a 1973 memo from Richard Maxwell, the archivist who was the BLM specialist, to Dr. Harold Pinkett, who was the branch chief at the time, concerning the status of the inventory. According to Maxwell, he and several others in the branch had worked on descriptions of some of the divisions but before the inventory could be completed the work was transferred

to a newly organized project division. Completion of the inventory then was assigned to staff members who had no familiarity with the records and their work was poor. He estimated that it would take up to 3 years to get the inventory ready for publication. Frankly, I had discovered that many of the entries prepared before the transfer were inadequate as well, and I found it necessary to revise much of the material. In addition to the descriptive work, I also performed holdings maintenance, doing foldering, reboxing, labeling, etc. so this volume of the guide ended up taking nearly 10 years, not 3 or 4.

Interviewer: Was there any in particular group of records that you liked best?

Kyasnicka: Well, when I worked in reference I had the reputation, such as it is, of being an expert on the records of Indian Affairs. While I enjoyed working with those records I really liked working with the records of the Work Projects Administration. Have you ever worked with them?

Interviewer: A little bit.

Kyasnicka: The WPA did so many things that no matter how outlandish a researcher's request sounded, you could never dismiss it because chances are the WPA did it. The WPA microfilm records were awful to work with, but I really had fun working with paper records. While I'm on the subject of the WPA records I might as well mention a very troubling matter. In recent years staff members have frequently been assigned to perform holdings maintenance or other project records they don't know. The reference staff had no supervisory control over these people and were not consulted about the work they were doing. The WPA cultural project records were well covered by good finding aids, but an individual from the Still Pictures unit began working on the records, rearranging and reboxing them with no regard to the existing finding aids and without consulting with the reference staff. This caused no end of trouble for the reference people who had to retrieve them for reference requests. A similar problem occurred with the townsite records of the Bureau of Land Management. The agency had used a complicated filing system but a finding aid giving the box number for each file existed. Holdings maintenance people repacked and reboxed nearly 100 boxes with no regard for the finding aid, leaving half the finding aid virtually worthless and creating a major retrieval problem for an already overworked reference staff. As a result, when I described the records for the GLO guide I had to annotate the finding aid with the revised box numbers for the contents of those boxes. In many such instances the lack of staff communication and supervision has been a real problem.

Interviewer: I was going to ask you a similar question. What were some of the challenges that you faced in your work?

Kyasnicka: How many of these interviews have you conducted?

Interviewer: About a half a dozen

Kyasnicka: Has anyone complained about NARS A1?

Interviewer: Not that I recall.

Kyasnicka: NARS A1 was an early attempt at description. For me the fun went out of the work when I had to deal with NARS A1. The programmers developed this complicated scheme that required a jurisdictional history that would account for the placement of every series of records in a record group, including those in the field and those that would be accessioned in the future. It was all recorded on a form using letters and numbers to indicate jurisdictional levels and placement of series. The program was eventually abandoned but the series descriptions live on in microfiche. In my opinion implementation of the program was ill advised. Instead of selecting one record group as a pilot program to see if the system actually worked, it was put into effect agency wide. All new accessions had to be described using the new system which meant that for each accession enough forms had to be submitted to account for the placement level of each new series. It was about a year and a half before written instructions were issued. To make it worse, the entries were reviewed and accepted and rejected by two archivists who really had little experience dealing with large series of central files covering multiple subjects. One reviewer came from the Still Pictures unit where description was done at the item level and the other from military records where many series were relatively small. Descriptions for correspondence series were frequently sent back with instructions to provide more subject information. Also, if the person entering the data on the computer made a mistake putting in location information you would find the description off in left field instead of where it was supposed to be.

At one point the decision was made to enter descriptions of all accessioned microfilm into the system. Now the WPA was one of the first agencies to microfilm its records for preservation purposes. Once microfilmed, the paper records were destroyed. The record group included hundreds of rolls of microfilm, most of them arranged by state, many of them containing copies of several series. A finding aid existed by the entries were not detailed enough for NARS A1. I spent hours checking film and converting the finding aid entries to conform to the system. I even worked on it at home. I had completed and submitted entries for about half the states when the program was abandoned. All in all the NARS A1 experience was not a happy one as far as I was concerned.

Interviewer: Was that one reason why you didn't want to go back to the reference unit.

Kyasnicka: No, that was all passed by 1989. I had been doing reference and project work for a long time, since 1967, and I was ready for a change.

Interviewer: How do you divide reference up? Was there a certain number of letters you answered and a time limit for a search?

Kyasnicka: Well we had a fairly large staff. Technicians would generally handle the genealogy letters and more routine letters and the archivists would take care of the more complicated requests and deal with the researchers. During the early years we had a separate research room on 11E for Indian history researchers who had to use large bound indexes and letter registers. That was closed before I left for the editorial office and the researchers had to sue microfilm copies of the indexes and registers in the microfilm reading room. The branch included the agriculture, interior, and New Deal records.

Interviewer: By very large staff you mean bigger than we are today?

Kyasnicka: Oh yes. Now there aren't enough reference people to really do the job and the way that reference is handled is different too. If time permitted we used to spend quite a lot of time on requests. Deadlines were more flexible. I mean, if you got a complicated letter you had the time to try and find the material without worrying too much about a deadline. In that respect the work was much more satisfying.

We had several technicians who were very good. One in particular Samella Anderson, should have been an archivist but she didn't have the educational background. She was very good at organization. The Bureau of Indian Affairs included one large series of letterpress copies of letters sent. Hundreds of volumes that were arranged by division. They all had identical bindings and many of the spines were missing or falling off. Each volume contained about 1000 pages so the idea of microfilming them for preservation purposes was out of the question since each page would have had to be backed to prevent bleed through. Very time consuming and way too costly. So we decided to have them all rebound even though that was also very expensive. Mrs. Anderson was put in charge of the project and she saw it through to completion, making out all the service orders, compiling the information for the spines, getting the volumes to the lab, etc. We also decided to have the volumes color coded with different color bindings for each division. Time spent servicing that series has been greatly reduced. She also wrote well and she drafted several microfilm pamphlets. We got along well for a brief period, for reasons I can't now recall, the two of us pretty much handling all of the reference. I do remember we were without a secretary. I did enjoy my time in reference but after awhile you get burned out.

Interviewer: I was looking at the interview with John Taylor and he was talking about when he was in reference he would see students from all over the world. He hardly ever saw American students coming in. Those who did come told him that their professors would tell them, "Don't go to the archives, it's too complicated to find anything." Did you ever hear that?

Kyasnicka: I never heard that but, he worked in a completely different area and with sensitive records. We got a lot of students and historians writing on Indian matters. And the one thing about the Indian researchers is when they finish working on one topic they went on to another one in the same field. The New Deal researchers were different. Usually they researched one topic and when they finished that they wouldn't be back again. They wouldn't pursue anything else in that area. But I got to know some of the Indian researchers quite well because they were all repeats.

Interviewers: Yes, Taylor was working with intelligence records.

Kyasnicka: That may be why he had few American researchers. They probably knew the problems involved whereas the foreigners didn't. A lot of Europeans are interested in Indians and we corresponded with them. We had this one fellow who wrote all the time, asking for a few documents each time. We were essentially doing his research for him.

Interviewers: We still have people like that, a German in particular.

Kyasnicka: Yes, it's the same one. At one point we had cut him off. A year or so later, he started writing again. By then we had a different branch chief; I told him that the guy was nothing by a nuisance and he would be driving us crazy again with his incessant requests, but he insisted we had to do the research and reply. I pointed out that if we refused the fellow couldn't go to his congressman and complain, but to no avail. We wouldn't even do such long term research for a tax payer, but because he was European we had to comply. If we had just held the line . . . it's all well and good to do it for a few things, but you can't do it indefinitely. Even taxpayers would have eventually been told to come in and do the research themselves. I guess we're still answering him.

Interviewer: This researcher also said he thought the Archives intentionally withheld information about the records.

Kyasnicka: Well that is interesting. I know that the reference people are of two minds about the dissemination of a lot of information about the records because there never has been a large enough staff to handle all the requests that result. Any time you publicize something that people are interested in you're going to get requests. I was doing reference when the first revision of the guide to genealogical records was done and we were not too happy because we already had all the genie requests we could handle.

Tape Side 2

Kyasnicka: Now I've been on both sides of the issue. When the latest revision of the genie guide was made I was one of the people requesting information from the reference staff. I was doing the same thing that no one was happy about it in the first phase. In fact I rewrote the section on the American Indians. Mary Francis

Ronan who handles the reference on Indian records was happy to have me do it even though I made it much more detailed than it was before. Of course, the Master Location Register which we now have makes it much easier to locate the various series so the impact on the reference staff is not as great as it once was. At any rate, Mary Frances seems to be happy with the end result. The staff generally is happy to have the holdings publicized but at the same time when the public makes inquiries we frequently have to tell them the material is here, but you have to come and do the research.

Interviewer: Yes, we can't even copy it for them without payment.

Kyasnicka: Yes, the National Archives is less of a service organization now than it used to be.

Interviewer: I was wondering about the appraisal function. When did that kick in?

Kyasnicka: I was never really involved with that much although as assistant branch chief I did review some draft appraisal schedules. I remember one that came through that covered the education records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. All the records listed as permanent were procedural issuances and similar items. Not one correspondence series was deemed worthy of preservation yet the correspondence provided the information about how programs were working. I suggested that the appraisers take another look.

Interviewer: Did you do much with the agencies?

Kyasnicka: When we first came we had a lot of interaction with both the Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. We loaned records to them on a regular basis. We had one technician who did nothing but handle loans to the BLM. Eventually the Archives put an end to the practice and the bureau employees had to come to the archives and do their own research. Law clerks from the Department of Justice were regulars doing research for Indian law suits. No matter how often they came they always put off the research until the last minute and they always had to have copies made immediately because they were going to court within a matter of days. That was pretty maddening. They had one researcher who always used microfilm in our Indian research room and he never did learn how to load the microfilm reader. Someone always had to assist him.

Interviewer: I know what you mean. I could add some stories myself. Do you remember any organization issues that were prominent or has it always been the same pretty much . . . we are always behind?

Kyasnicka: Yes, we are always behind. I was not too surprised about the sudden interest in all the undescribed records. At one point there was a discussion about how to get intellectual control over new accessions and the decision was made to go with different levels of description. The series the public was most interested in

would be described. Otherwise reliance was placed on the descriptions supplied by the agencies such as box lists and box labels. Well, when I was doing research for the Department of Agriculture volume of Trans-Mississippi West guide back in the early 1990s I worked with some recent accessions. The labels on the boxes frequently were inaccurate. One or two series would be listed on the labels and there could be several more unidentified series in the box. The unidentified series weren't on any available lists. The agriculture agency records may have been an isolated case but I doubt it. I told Sharon Thibodeau about this at the time, but she wasn't in a position to do anything about it. So the current description mess doesn't surprise me. There's such a huge descriptive back log now that addressing it is changing the way the NARA organization operates.

Interviewer: Thinking over your career, what have been the biggest changes you have seen both in terms of how the National Archives has changed and the things outside the National Archives has changed and impacted the institution.

Kyasnicka: The agency is less of a service organization than it was when I came--less user friendly. The emphasis now all seems to be on electronics and who knows how that's all going to work out in future. It seems to me that the emphasis is more on non-archival issues than it used to be. The archivists themselves are becoming a dying breed. The shift is to technicians and computer staff. The idea that everything can be digitized so research can be done online is not very practical to my way of thinking. The new staff is not being trained to really know the records and how they work, how series relate to one another, the connections that exist between record groups, etc. These relationships are not likely to be translated to the computerized versions of the records. In the long run the researchers are going to be shortchanged. I don't have that close a connection to reference anymore, but I don't researchers come here to work on dissertations and other scholarly works they way the used to. They're relying more and more on secondary sources or what they can get off the web. When I first came it was fun working here, staff enjoyed their jobs, and I'm not sure they do anymore. It seems like there's a lot of anger out there now, but I may be wrong. I've been a little out of touch. I've had a "cushie" job for nearly 20 years. If I hadn't been working on the guide I would have retired long ago. Although I feel like I may have worked through my retirement years I've had the satisfaction of producing something that I hope the staff and the public will find useful.

Interviewer: You did that for sure

Kyasnicka: I have known a few of the Archivists somewhat. Bert Rhoads worked his way up through the ranks and I had personal contacts with him both before and after he became Archivist. He was a nice fellow and well liked by the staff. My personal favorite was Dr. Warner who was responsible for getting NARA's independence from the General Services Administration. Unlike some of the other Archivists we've had, he made a real attempt to get to know the staff. One Christmas when I was still in reference I was working at my desk near the exit to the

stacks from the branch office in 13E when Dr. Warner startled me by walking in from the stacks. He'd been going throughout the building greeting everyone. He was genuinely interested in the staff. Both he and his wife were very friendly people. They were interested in one of the national parks and I did a little research for them. I located some documents and they came into the stack to see them; we had a very nice chat. After she returned home Mrs. Warner was looking at *Indian-White Relations: A Persistent Paradox*, the published collection of papers given at NARA's Indian-Whit Relations conference held in June 1972. I was co-director of the conference with Jane Smith, the branch chief, and co-editor of the volume. When she saw my name on the book she wrote me a note apologizing for not connecting me with the book. It was something she certainly didn't have to do. It was just a nice gesture. They were very nice people and the staff was sorry when he left. I think everyone liked him.

Interviewer: You mentioned a conference and Virginia Purdy mentioned a conference, too. They used to have conferences with some frequency?

Kyasnicka: yes, I think we had about ten of them. I have a couple stories about them, if you want to hear them.

Interviewer: Go ahead, we have plenty of tape.

Kyasnicka: The Indian White Relations Conference was held at a very touchy time. The Indian activist organization AIM was very active and members objected to our choice of keynote speaker, Father F. Paul Prucha, a Jesuit priest who was, and still is, one of the leading historians on relations between native Americans (to be politically correct) and the federal government. We had arranged for a young Indian to deliver a paper, but he canceled at the last minute, hoping to embarrass us I'm sure. We got a well-known Indian scholar to replace him, however. Luckily enough, the programs hadn't been printed at that point so the conference attendees didn't know about his defection. We had a mix of nationally known historians, younger scholars whose careers were just beginning, and archivists on the program. Well over 200 people attended the conference.

In addition to the papers and comments delivered at the conference we distributed papers on the Indian-related holdings of the regional archives that were prepared by the regional staffs. One of the papers in particular gave us a good laugh. The comment was made that one Indian agency depended upon a nearby fort for its diseases. These regional papers were later used when Ed Hill prepared his guide to Indian records in the National Archives.

We made one logistical mistake. Some of the sessions were concurrent with one held in the theater and the other in one of the smaller meeting rooms. We put the military history session in the theater and the session on Indian-related records sources in Oklahoma in a smaller conference room. The problem was that Angie Debo, an elderly historian from Oklahoma who was a specialist on the Five Civilized

Tribes, was delivering the paper. She was in her eighties at the time and she had a standing room only crowd. Everyone wanted to see Angie Debo. She had worked on the WPA state guide to Oklahoma and her account of what had gone on in the state caused quite a ruckus. The guide ended up being heavily edited so I don't know how much of the published volume was actually hers. She was a delightful woman and after the conference I helped her with some research for her biography of Geronimo.

A really nice opening night reception for the attendees was held in the hall of the Smithsonian castle building. After the conference one of the Indian participants told me she didn't think much of the conference, but she sure did like the reception.

Conferences were held on a number of topics: cartographic and audio visual records, military matters, the territorial system, women's history, and urban affairs. I have another story about the urban affairs conference. The conference director called on the staff to prepare about 20 reference source papers for distribution to the attendees. I was assigned to compile one on the New Deal in Detroit. We were told that the papers would be published in the conference volume. Well, the papers were so uneven in quality that none of them were published in the volume, which turned out to be the shortest of the series. Some months later, one of the conference attendees came in to research the New Deal records. He had a copy of my paper in hand and told me that it was better and more useful than anything in the published volume. Some of the source papers were eventually published as reference information papers, but I decided I didn't want mine published. I wanted to show how the records could be used and the kind of information that could be found in them. So the paper was in two parts, one an overview of the history of Detroit during the period and the other a discussion of the record groups and the records I used to prepare the history. The history was based entirely on the records-no secondary sources-and I didn't feel all that confident about its accuracy. The records portion of the paper was a precursor of what I've tried to do with the Trans-Mississippi West volumes.

So that's about it. Over the years I've been fortunate enough to meet some interesting and prominent historians and to become friends with some of them. As a matter of fact, one of them is coming to the archives this week and I've been helping get things ready for him. I met him at the time of the Indian-White Relations conference and years later he was one of the historians on the committee responsible for the Trans-Mississippi West guide. An appropriate end to my career.

Interviewer: Thank you for sharing your views with us.

Gift of Historical Materials of **Robert Kvasnicka** to  
The National Archives and Records Administration (NARA)

1. In accordance with the provisions of Chapter 21 of Title 44, United States Code, and subject to the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth, I, **Robert Kvasnicka** (hereinafter referred to as the Donor), hereby give, donate, and convey to the United States of America, for eventual deposit in the National Archives of the United States (hereinafter referred to as the National Archives), the following historical materials (hereinafter referred to as the Materials):

1. Recording (media) of an oral history interview with the donor on behalf of the National Archives Assembly Legacy Project.
2. Transcript of an oral history interview with the donor.
3. Letter from National Archives Assembly Legacy Project Coordinator Patrice Brown to the donor, inviting the Donor to participate in an oral history interview for the Assembly's Legacy Project.

2. Because the Materials were generated in connection with the National Archives Assembly Legacy Project-an oral history project designed to capture the institutional memory of retiring NARA staff-the Donor stipulates that the Materials be accessioned into the National Archives and allocated to the donated historical materials collection of the National Archives Assembly. This collection is designated as NAA and is entitled, Records of the National Archives Assembly.

3. The Donor warrants that, immediately prior to the execution of the deed of gift, he possessed title to, and all rights and interests in, the Materials free and clear of all liens, claims, charges, and encumbrances.

4. The Donor hereby gives and assigns to the United States of America all copyright which s/he has in the Materials.

5. Title to the Materials shall pass to the United States of America upon their delivery to the Archivist of the United States or the Archivist's delegate (hereinafter referred to as the Archivist).

6. Following delivery, the Materials shall be maintained by NARA at a location to be determined by the Archivist in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 21 of Title 44, United States Code, and provided that at any time after delivery, the Donor shall be permitted freely to examine any of the Materials during the regular working hours of the depository in which they are preserved.

7. It is the Donor's wish that the Materials in their entirety be made available for research as soon as possible following their deposit in the National Archives.

8. The Archivist may, subject only to restrictions placed upon him by law or regulation, provide for the preservation, arrangement, repair and rehabilitation, duplication and reproduction, description, exhibition, display, and servicing of the Materials as may be needed or appropriate.

9. The Archivist may enter into agreements for the temporary deposit of the Materials in any depository administered by NARA.

10. In the event that the Donor may from time to time hereafter give, donate, and convey to the United States of America additional historical materials, title to such additional historical materials shall pass to the United States of America upon their delivery to the Archivist, and all of the foregoing provisions of this instrument of gift shall be applicable to such additional historical materials. An appendix shall be prepared and attached hereto that references this deed of gift and that describes the additional historical materials being donated and delivered. Each such appendix shall be properly executed by being signed and dated by the Donor and the Archivist.

Signed: Robert M. Krausnick  
Donor

Date: June 15, 2009

Pursuant to the authority of Chapter 21 of Title 44, United States Code, the foregoing gift of historical materials is determined to be in the public interest and is accepted on behalf of the United States of America, subject to the terms and conditions set forth herein.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_  
Archivist of the United States

Date: \_\_\_\_\_